UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/672,796	09/26/2003	Andrew Morgan	TRAN-P162	9469

45590 7590 03/10/2009

TRANSMETA C/O MURABITO, HAO & BARNES LLP
TWO NORTH MARKET STREET
THIRD FLOOR
SAN JOSE, CA 95113

EXAMINER	
PICH, PONNOREAY	
ART UNIT	**PAPER NUMBER**
2435	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
03/10/2009	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/672,796	MORGAN ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	PONNOREAY PICH	2435	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE *3* MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *09 January 2009*.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-26* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-26* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Claims 1-26 are pending.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments submitted on 1/9/09 were fully considered, but are not persuasive. Applicant argues Ma does not teach said internal memory is *for storing data associated with a key-based cryptographic process*.

The examiner respectfully notes that all the claims under contention are apparatus claims. The patentability of an apparatus depends on its structure (see MPEP 2114-2115). That the memory is *for storing data associated with a key-based cryptographic process* does not limit the scope apparatus claims since it defines the intended use of a portion of the claimed apparatus and in no way defines the structure of the apparatus.

Further, even if one were to give the feature under contention patentable weight, the argument is not persuasive because one cannot show nonobviousness by attacking references individually where the rejections are based on combinations of references. See *In re Keller*, 642 F.2d 413, 208 USPQ 871 (CCPA 1981); *In re Merck & Co.,* 800 F.2d 1091, 231 USPQ 375 (Fed. Cir. 1986). One must consider what the combined teachings of the references would have rendered obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art. Ma's internal memory stores data that is accessible only within the processor (col 2, lines 21-41; col 4, lines 4-11; and Fig 1). Easter discloses data associated with a key-based cryptographic process being stored in a memory (col 5, lines 6-11 and col 6, lines

14-19). From these two teachings, the limitation under contention would have been obvious to one skilled in the art for the reasons discussed in the prior office action.

The prior rejections are repeated below for record.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-3, 5-7, 9-11, 14-15, 18-21, and 25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over Easter et al (US 5,563,950) in view of Ma et al (US 7,062,769).

Claim 1:

Easter discloses:

1. A digital secret comprising a secret key (i.e. the DES secret key) used in a key based cryptographic process and wherein said digital secret is operable to be used exclusively by said processor for both encryption and decryption (Fig 5; col 4, lines 27-29; and col 8, lines 18-18). *A DES secret key is operable to be exclusively used by the processor for both encryption and decryption.*

2. A cryptographic engine for performing said key-based cryptographic process internally within said processor (Fig 5, DES engine 21), said cryptographic engine operable to access said digital secret (col 8, lines 18-22 and Fig 5).
3. Internal memory coupled to said cryptographic engine for supporting said key-based cryptographic process (Fig 5, items 25 and 51).

Easter does not explicitly disclose wherein said digital secret is stored only within said processor and wherein said internal memory is further for storing data associated with said key-based cryptographic process, wherein said data is accessible only within said processor. However, Easter discloses storing a key only within an integrated circuit (col 5, lines 6-11 and col 6, lines 14-19). Further, Ma discloses combining multiple integrated circuits into one processor, wherein the processor has an internal memory for storing data which is accessible only within the processor (col 2, lines21-41; col 4, lines 4-11; and Fig 1). The processor 10 shown in Figure 1 of Ma has a private memory 14 which is used to store data that is accessible only within the processor.

Note that the IC chip disclosed by Easter is meant to be incorporated as part of further circuitry (col 6, lines 14-15). At the time applicant's invention was made, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art to modify Easter's invention using Ma's teachings such that the IC circuit disclosed by Easter was integrated into a single processor as taught by Ma and using a private memory to store the DES secret key so that the digital secret was only accessible within the processor. Note that the DES secret key is data associated with said key-based cryptographic process.

One skilled would have been motivated to only store the DES encryption key within the IC chip disclosed by Easter because it would prevent unauthorized personnel from accessing the key and the software. One skilled would have been motivated to incorporate the IC circuit disclosed by Easter within a single processor having a memory which contains data only accessible within the processor because Ma discloses that it was desirable in the art to place highly complex system on a single chip to provide powerful computing platforms on the chip (col 1, lines 21-27) and because Easter's IC chip is meant to be incorporated as part of further circuitry (Easter: col 6, lines 14-15).

Claim 10:

Easter discloses:

1. A secure cryptographic unit (Fig 5, item 53), said cryptographic unit comprising:
    a. A cryptographic engine for performing a key-based cryptographic process (Fig 5, items 57 and 21).
    b. A digital secret exclusively accessible to said cryptographic engine, wherein said digital secret comprises a secret key used in said key-based cryptographic process, and wherein said secret key is operable to be used exclusively by said processor for both encryption and decryption (col 4, lines 28-29 and col 8, lines 10-22).
    c. Internal memory coupled to said cryptographic engine for supporting said key-based cryptographic process (col 8, lines 10-22 and Fig 5).

Easter does not explicitly disclose wherein said cryptographic unit internally provides secure cryptographic capabilities as a functional unit within said processor and wherein said internal memory is further for storing data associated with said key-based cryptographic process, wherein said data is accessible only within said processor. However, Easter discloses that his secure cryptographic unit is meant to be incorporated into further circuitry (col 6, lines 15-16). Easter discloses storing a key only within an integrated circuit (col 5, lines 6-11 and col 6, lines 14-19). Further, Ma discloses combining multiple integrated circuits into one processor, wherein the processor has an internal memory for storing data which is accessible only within the processor (col 2, lines21-41; col 4, lines 4-11; and Fig 1). The processor 10 shown in Figure 1 of Ma has a private memory 14 which is used to store data that is accessible only within the processor.

At the time applicant's invention was made, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art to modify Easter's invention using Ma's teachings such that the IC circuit disclosed by Easter was integrated into a single processor as taught by Ma and using a private memory to store the DES secret key so that the digital secret was only accessible within the processor. Note that the DES secret key is data associated with said key-based cryptographic process.

One skilled would have been motivated to only store the DES encryption key within the IC chip disclosed by Easter because it would prevent unauthorized personnel from accessing the key and the software. One skilled would have been motivated to incorporate the IC circuit disclosed by Easter within a single processor having a memory

which contains data only accessible within the processor because Ma discloses that it was desirable in the art to place highly complex system on a single chip to provide powerful computing platforms on the chip (col 1, lines 21-27) and because Easter's IC chip is meant to be incorporated as part of further circuitry (Easter: col 6, lines 14-15).

Claim 21:

Easter discloses:

1. A secure hardware environment providing core processing functionality (Fig 5, item 53), wherein said secure hardware environment comprises:
    a. A secure cryptography unit (Fig 5, item 21), for providing secure cryptographic capabilities as a functional unit within said secure hardware environment (Fig 5), wherein said secure cryptography unit is operable to facilitate performance of a key-based cryptographic process and wherein said key-based cryptographic process comprises encryption using a digital secret and decryption using said digital secret, and wherein said key-based cryptographic process further comprises accessing data (col 4, lines 28-29 and col 8, lines 10-22). *To perform cryptography using the secret key, one must access data.*

Easter does not explicitly disclose said key-based cryptographic process is performed exclusively by said processor and wherein said data is accessible only within said processor. However, Easter discloses that his secure cryptographic unit is meant to be incorporated into circuitry (col 6, lines 15-16). Easter discloses storing a key only

within an integrated circuit (col 5, lines 6-11 and col 6, lines 14-19). Further, Ma discloses combining multiple integrated circuits into one processor, wherein the processor has an internal memory for storing data which is accessible only within the processor (col 2, lines21-41; col 4, lines 4-11; and Fig 1). The processor 10 shown in Figure 1 of Ma has a private memory 14 which is used to store data that is accessible only within the processor.

At the time applicant's invention was made, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art to modify Easter's invention using Ma's teachings such that the IC circuit disclosed by Easter was integrated into a single processor as taught by Ma and using a private memory to store the DES secret key so that the digital secret was only accessible within the processor and the key-based cryptographic process is performed exclusively by the processor. Note that the DES secret key is data associated with said key-based cryptographic process.

One skilled would have been motivated to only store the DES encryption key within the IC chip disclosed by Easter because it would prevent unauthorized personnel from accessing the key and the software. One skilled would have been motivated to incorporate the IC circuit disclosed by Easter within a single processor having a memory which contains data only accessible within the processor so that the key based cryptographic process was performed exclusively by the processor because Ma discloses that it was desirable in the art to place highly complex system on a single chip to provide powerful computing platforms on the chip (col 1, lines 21-27) and because

Easter's IC chip is meant to be incorporated as part of further circuitry (Easter: col 6, lines 14-15).

Claim 2:

Easter further discloses an internal bus for facilitating secure communication between said cryptography engine, said digital secret, and said internal memory within said processor (col 8, lines 13-17 and Fig 5, internal bus 37).

Claim 3:

Easter further discloses wherein said digital secret is securely confined within said processor (col 8, lines 18-22).

Claim 5:

Easter does not explicitly disclose wherein said data comprise intermediate data generated by said key-based cryptographic process. However, official notice is taken that having a software based DES engine and internal memory that securely stores intermediate data created within a key based cryptographic process was well known in the art at the time applicant's invention was made. It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art to modify Easter's DES engine to utilize software and to have the internal memory securely stores intermediate data created within said key-based cryptographic process. One skilled would have been motivated to do utilize a software DES engine because it is a design choice and one skilled would have been motivated to have the internal memory securely store intermediate data created by the DES engine because it would prevent leaking of the DES key. The DES key is an intermediate data.

Claim 6:

As per the limitation that the processor of claim 1 further comprises a cryptographic unit comprising a functional unit within said processor for securely executing said key-based cryptographic process internally within said processor, wherein said cryptographic unit comprises: said digital secret; said cryptographic engine; and said internal memory, it is obvious to the combination invention of Easter and Ma. Note that as discussed in claim 1, said digital secret; said cryptographic engine; and said internal memory are contained in Easter's integrated circuit 53 (Fig 5), which is meant for incorporation into circuitry (col 6, lines 14-15). If one were to incorporate integrated circuit 53 into Ma's processor as intended by Easter, one would end up with a processor as recited in claim 6. Integrated circuitry 53 can be considered the recited cryptographic unit. Note also that making things separate or integral is obvious (see MPEP 2144.04(V)(B)).

Claims 7 and 11:

Easter further discloses wherein said key-based cryptographic process comprises: a key based encryption process; and a key-based decryption process (col 4, lines 27-29).

Claims 9 and 14:

Easter does not explicitly disclose wherein said digital secret is unique to said processor and is permanently and physically manifested within said processor. However, official notice is taken that using a key unique to a processor was well known in the art at the time applicant's invention was made. It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art to utilize a digital secret that was unique to the processor because a

DES key is meant to be secret and use of a unique key would prevent accidental access to the software being secured by Easter and Ma's secure processor.

Further, Easter discloses that it was known to permanently and physically manifest a key within a processor (col 2, lines 44-46; col 5, lines 6-11; and col 8, lines 29-31). Storing of a key via a fuse array would permanently and physically manifest a key within the processor. At the time applicant's invention was made, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art to further modify Easter and Ma's combination invention such that the DES key was permanently and physically manifest a key within the processor. The rationale for why it is obvious is that the simple substitution of a key which is not permanently and physically manifested in the processor for one that is would do no more than yield a predictable result. One skilled would have been motivated to do so because it would ensure the secrecy of the key (col 8, lines 29-31).

Claim 15:

Easter does not explicitly disclose wherein said digital secret comprises a plurality of fusible links to manifest said digital secret by permanently setting a binary state in each of said plurality of fusible links. However, Easter discloses that it was known in the art to use a plurality of fusible links to manifest a key by permanently setting a binary state in each of the plurality of fusible links (col 5, lines 10-11 and 26-47 and col 8, lines 29-31).

At the time applicant's invention was made, it would have been obvious to further modify Easter and Ma's combination invention according to the limitations recited in claim 15 by programming a fuse array to store the DES key. The rationale for why it is

obvious is that use of a fuse array to store the DES key instead of key array 25 is nothing more that the simple substitution of one known element for another to obtain the predictable result of a DES key stored in a fuse array. One skilled would have been motivated to do so because it would ensure the secrecy of the key (col 8, lines 29-31).

Claims 18 and 25:

As per the limitation that said secure cryptographic unit comprises a fully integrated circuit within said processor, it is obvious to the combination invention of Easter and Ma. Easter's integrated circuit 53 is a fully integrated circuit (Fig 5) and is meant to be incorporated into a circuit (col 6, lines 14-15). When IC 53 is incorporated into Ma's secure processor, it would be incorporated as an integrated circuit within Ma's processor. Note also that making things separate or integral is obvious (see MPEP 2144.04(V)(B)).

Claim 19:

Easter further discloses wherein said digital secret and said internal memory are fully integrated with said cryptography engine to facilitate communication without use of a bus (Fig 5 and col 6, lines 14-15).

Note that the above limitation is interpreted as best understood from what is disclosed in the specification. The examiner assumes that "without use of a bus" refers to an external bus and does not refer to internal buses since one skilled in the art would recognize that any type of circuit would have some form of busses, thus the total absence of a bus in a circuit or processor is impossible. The cryptography engine, internal memory, and digital secret seen in Figure 5 of Easter is encapsulated as one

unit (i.e. IC 53), thus these components do not utilize any external busses to communicate.

Claim 20:

Easter does not explicitly disclose wherein said key-based cryptography process comprises a Triple Data Encryption Algorithm (TDEA or Triple DES) cryptographic process. However, official notice is taken that Triple DES was a well known cryptographic process at the time applicant's invention was made. It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art to modify Easter's invention such that said key-based cryptography process comprises Triple DES cryptographic process. One skilled would have done so because Triple DES is more secure than DES. Further, it would have been obvious to do so because the substitution of a Triple DES engine for a DES engine would do no more than yield a predictable result.

Claim 4 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over Easter et al (US 5,563,950) in view of Ma et al (US 7,062,769) in further view of Galasso (US 6,598,165) and Moyer et al (US 2004/0243823).

Claim 4:

Easter does not explicitly disclose wherein said internal memory comprises microcode for implementing said key based-based cryptographic process on said data within said processor, and wherein said internal memory is operable to perform state tracking associated with said key-based cryptographic process.

However, Galasso discloses a key-based cryptographic process performed on data within a processor which utilizes microcode contained in an internal memory (col 3, lines 1-20). At the time applicant's invention was made, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art to further modify Easter and Ma's combination invention such that said internal memory comprises microcode for implementing said key based-based cryptographic process on data within said processor. The rationale for why this is obvious is that the simple substitution of the DES engine disclosed by Easter with a software based DES engine disclosed by Galasso, which requires the internal memory to comprise microcode for implementing the DES algorithm is nothing more than simple substitution of one known element for another to obtain predictable results.

Further, Moyer discloses internal memory operable to perform state tracking associated with a data processing system (paragraphs 12 and 14). Moyer's invention tracks the state of a data processing system to determine when errors or access violations may occur (paragraph 4). At the time applicant's invention was made, it would have been obvious to further modify the combination invention of Easter, Ma, and Galasso such that the internal memory is operable to perform state tracking associated with said key-based cryptographic process. One skilled would have been motivated to do so because it would improve the security (Moyer: paragraph 38) of the secure processor having the software DES engine by catching errors and access violations. Note that the DES engine is a data processing system.

Claims 8, 13, and 22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Easter et al (US 5,563,950) in view of Ma et al (US 7,062,769) in further view of Fahrny (US 2004/0098591).

Claims 8, 13, and 22:

Easter further discloses a secure hardware environment providing core processing functionality (Fig 5).

Easter does not explicitly disclose secure software environment coupled to said secure hardware environment, said secure software environment generating executable instructions that are sent to said secure hardware environment for processing, said secure hardware environment in combination with said secure software environment providing processor capability, and wherein said secure hardware environment is accessible only through said secure software environment.

However, Fahrny discloses a secure software environment coupled to a secure hardware environment (paragraphs 10 and 26), said secure software environment generating executable instructions that are sent to said secure hardware environment for processing (Fig 1 and paragraphs 26-28), said secure hardware environment in combination with said secure software environment providing processor capability, and wherein said secure hardware environment is accessible only through said secure software environment (Fig 1, item 16 and paragraphs 28 and 31).

Note in the cited section of Fahrny that a secure hardware (Fig 1, item 16) authenticates software objects, including a trusted operating system at initialization.

Access to any items in the secure hardware has to be done via an authenticated software object, i.e. trusted OS. The combination of authenticated software objects, i.e. secure software environment, along with the secure hardware (Fig 1, item 16) provides processor capability.

At the time applicant's invention was made, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Easter and Ma's combination invention according to the limitations recited in claim 8 in light of Fahrny's teachings. One skilled would have been motivated to do so because Fahrny's teachings would further protect data within a secure hardware, i.e. Easter and Ma's secure processor, by authenticating software objects prior to allowing the software object access to any data in the secure hardware (Fahrny: paragraph 10). This would further ensure that unauthorized users could not access the software encrypted software or DES key illegally.

Claim 12 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Easter et al (US 5,563,950) in view of Ma et al (US 7,062,769) in further view of Cmelik et al (US 6,031,992).

Claim 12:

Easter does not explicitly disclose wherein said processor comprises a very long instruction word processor (VLIW) processor. However, Cmelik discloses wherein a processor comprises a very long instruction word processor (VLIW) processor (col 8, lines 51-65). At the time applicant's invention was made, it would have been obvious to

one skilled in the art to further modify Easter's invention according to the limitations recited in claim 12 in light of Cmelik's teachings. One skilled would have been motivated to dos o because use of a VLIW processor would increase the speed of processor execution (Cmelik: col 9, lines 51-65).

Claims 16-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Easter et al (US 5,563,950) in view of Ma et al (US 7,062,769) in further view of Balard et al (US 2004/0025036).

Claim 16:

As per claim 16, Easter does not disclose wherein said digital secret comprises a random number that is generated from an HMAC algorithm implemented on testing data associated with fabrication of said IC chip. However, Balard discloses the limitation (Figures 2 and 10). It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art to further modify Easter's invention according to the limitations recited in claim 16 in light of Balard's teachings. One skilled would have been motivated to do so because it would ensure uniqueness of the DES key.

Claim 17:

As per claim 17, Balard further discloses wherein said testing data comprises die test data (paragraph 42 and Fig 6). However, Easter, Ma, and Balard do not explicitly discloses testing data comprising wafer test data. However, official notice is taken that testing data comprises wafer test data was well known in the art at the time applicant's

invention was made. It would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art to include wafer test data within the combination invention of Easter, Ma, and Balard as said testing data because testing a processor's wafer ensures quality of the processor.

Claims 23, 24, and 26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over Easter et al (US 5,563,950) in view of Ma et al (US 7,062,769) in further view of Moyer et al (US 2004/0243823)

Claim 23:

Easter further discloses wherein said secure cryptography unit further comprises:

1. A cryptography engine for performing said key based cryptographic process (Fig 5, DES engine 21).
2. Said digital secret accessible exclusively to said cryptography engine , wherein said digital secret comprises a secret key used in said key-based cryptographic process (col 4, lines 28-29 and col 8, lines 10-22).
3. Internal memory coupled to said cryptography engine for supporting said key-based cryptographic process (Fig 5, items 25 and 37).

Easter does not explicitly disclose said internal memory performs state tracking associated with said key-based cryptographic process. However, software based DES engine were well known in the art. Further, Moyer discloses internal memory operable to perform state tracking associated with a data processing system (paragraphs 12 and 14). Moyer's invention tracks the state of a data processing system to determine when

errors or access violations may occur (paragraph 4). At the time applicant's invention was made, it would have been obvious to further modify the combination invention of Easter and Ma such that a software DES engine was used and the internal memory is operable to perform state tracking associated with said key-based cryptographic process. One skilled would have been motivated to use a software DES engine because use of a software or hardware DES engine is an obvious design choice. One skilled would have been motivated to incorporate Moyer's teachings in the manner discussed because it would improve the security (Moyer: paragraph 38) of the secure processor having the software DES engine by catching errors and access violations. Note that the DES engine is a data processing system.

Claim 24:

Easter and Ma further discloses wherein said internal memory is operable to securely store said data (Ma: col 4, lines 6-11), and wherein said data comprises intermediate data generated by said key-based cryptographic process (Easter: Fig 2 and col 8, lines 18-26).

Claim 26:

Claim 26 recites a further limitation substantially similar to what is recited in claim 19 and is rejected for similar reasons.

Conclusion

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to PONNOREAY PICH whose telephone number is (571)272-7962. The examiner can normally be reached on 9:00am-4:30pm Mon-Thurs.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kim Vu can be reached on 571-272-3859. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Ponnoreay Pich/
Examiner, Art Unit 2435